

says, in the shadow of RFK Stadium in the Southeast part of this city. He served as chair of the economics department at Swarthmore College, my daughter Emily's alma mater. Dr. Jefferson would be only the fourth Black man to serve as a Fed Governor.

Both Dr. Jefferson and Dr. Cook will bring important perspectives on poverty, inequality, and racial equity to the Fed—perspectives that have been missing for most of the last 109 years.

Today, we will vote on Jerome Powell, who has earned the opportunity—earned the opportunity—to lead the Fed as Chair for another term. He has been a steadfast defender of the Federal Reserve's independence, resisting unprecedented attacks by former President Trump to politicize the Fed. I know he will similarly resist those in Congress who see inflation not as a burden on American families but as a chance to blame the President of the United States for something that is complex due chiefly to things that happened before he was President and mainly to corporate greed and global events. Along with now-Vice Chair Brainard, he played an instrumental role in stabilizing our economy in the face of the coronavirus pandemic. He has been a reliable voice and a steady hand through this crisis.

All of the nominees for the Fed have received an unprecedented amount of support from across the political spectrum—more letters of endorsement than I have ever seen for Federal Reserve nominees—from State regulators, economists, bankers, and former government officials, consumer groups, civil rights advocates, and on and on and on.

I congratulate Vice Chair Brainard and Governor Cook and Governor Jefferson on their nominations and confirmations. I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm Chair Powell.

Last point. I will continue to work with my colleagues to round out the full complement of the Federal Reserve—it has not had a full seven members in almost a decade—when we confirm in a few weeks the Vice Chair of Supervision nominee, Michael Barr. The Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee will hold a hearing on Mr. Barr's nomination next week. We will move swiftly to vote.

I urge my colleagues to support Chair Powell today and to support Mr. Barr's nomination as Vice Chair soon.

I am confident all of the President's nominees will fiercely guard the Fed's independence and will work to bring down prices and, most importantly, put workers and families at the center of our economic policy.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON POWELL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Powell nomination?

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 176 Ex.]

#### YEAS—80

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Padilla
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Risch
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Booker	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Inhofe	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kelly	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Sinema
Cassidy	King	Smith
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Tuberville
Crapo	Manchin	Van Hollen
Daines	Marshall	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Warnock
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Murray	

#### NAYS—19

Boozman	Markey	Scott (FL)
Braun	Menendez	Shelby
Cotton	Merkley	Sullivan
Cruz	Ossoff	Warren
Hawley	Paul	Wicker
Johnson	Rubio	
Lee	Sanders	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will immediately be notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2340

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor today and will, in short order, seek unanimous consent for the passage of the Daniel Aderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2021. This bill, which was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee last December with overwhelming bipartisan support, is named after Daniel Aderl, the 20-year-old son of U.S. District Court Judge Esther Salas.

Mr. President, 1 year 9 months 23 days ago, Daniel was brutally murdered by a gunman who targeted Judge Salas for her gender, her ethnicity, and because he could not accept a judgment in a case that she reached in her court.

To carry out his horrific hate crime, the gunman used publicly available information, tracking down Judge Salas to her home in New Jersey and mur-

dering Daniel in cold blood when he answered the door. And after that, her husband Mark also was shot and seriously wounded.

Every single day since July 19, 2020, Judge Salas and her husband Mark have been dealing with the immense grief of burying their only son. No parent should have to experience such a devastating loss. Yet, in the face of so much pain, Judge Salas has channeled it into purpose, embarking on a personal mission to increase the safety and privacy of her fellow judges and their families.

Now, I know Judge Salas well. Back in 2010, I was proud to recommend her to the Federal bench. A year later, when the Senate unanimously confirmed her by voice vote, she became the first Latina to serve on the district court of New Jersey.

After the horrific tragedy she suffered, I made a personal commitment to honor Daniel's legacy through action. I told her I would not rest until we enacted greater protections for those who serve on the Federal bench to prevent another judge from having to endure the senseless violence Judge Salas experienced.

The bipartisan bill I seek unanimous consent for is an effort I am proud to lead with 12 of my colleagues, including Senators DURBIN, GRASSLEY, BOOKER, GRAHAM and KENNEDY. Our bill would prevent potential assailants from using publicly available information to target judges or their families. It is a commonsense measure that would authorize the U.S. Marshal Service to monitor online threats and deter future attacks.

It is so common sense that it was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with strong bipartisan support—I am talking about a 21-to-0 vote in the affirmative.

It is so common sense, in fact, that just, I think, 2 days ago my Republican colleagues led a similar measure to safeguard Supreme Court Justices and their families.

So if the Senate passed an important bill without hearings—without hearings—directly to the floor to support and protect Supreme Court Justices and their families, I think we should do it as well for Federal judges. Nobody made an effort to change that bill.

There is simply no explanation or justification to protect Supreme Court Justices while delaying legislation to protect Federal judges who face the same, if not greater, risk.

No judge in America should have to fear for their lives as they work to uphold our Constitution, our democracy, and ensure all people have equal justice under the law.

Every day that we delay in passing this critical legislation is a day that we delay necessary protections for the guardians of our Constitution and the rule of law.

There are three branches of our government. One of the essential ones is the judiciary. They make decisions

every day about what is the law of the land and what is the answer to disputes among us as individuals and entities. If that judge is fearful that their decisions at the end of the day will lead to violence against them and their families, how long will their judgment not be affected and, therefore, how long will we as a nation be able to say that the rule of law is truly in place?

So I ask my Senate colleagues to join me today in honoring the life and memory of Daniel Anderl. Let us do the right thing and unanimously pass the Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2021 named after him.

So, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 190, S. 2340; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, I agree that members of the judicial branch need better protection. In fact, I have been appalled that leftwing pro-abortion groups released the addresses of our Supreme Court Justices and that there have been people at their houses trying to intimidate them. It is appalling and shouldn't happen. Whoever it was that released the addresses of the Supreme Court Justices should be punished.

So I think there is bipartisan support in this. I was disappointed though that the White House has not condemned the release of the Supreme Court Justices. I think that ranting and raving and noise all night is disturbing the peace and isn't actually First Amendment protected speech.

But if recent years have taught us anything, it is that Members of the legislative branch also need protection. That was clear in 2011 when Congresswoman Gabby Giffords was tragically shot while doing the most important part of her job, meeting with constituents.

Words cannot express how happy and inspired I was to see Congresswoman Giffords was in the Chamber as her husband, Senator KELLY, was recently sworn in, but words also cannot express the pain felt by the families of the people who were killed and wounded that day.

That should have been a wakeup call to better protect Members of Congress and, in doing so, better protect the people around them. But just a few years ago, a shooter nearly killed Congressman STEVE SCALISE during practice for the annual charity baseball game. I know. I was there. One staffer was shot less than 10 feet from me.

The Capitol Hill police were there and saved our lives. Had they not been there, things might have been much

worse. But the Capitol Police aren't everywhere, and our families live in many cities outside of Washington. Extending the provisions of this bill to Members of Congress would do nothing to change the content. In fact, I believe our legislative changes add four words "and Members of Congress."

So I think these protections actually are good protections. I agree with the spirit of the bill; I agree with the letter of the bill, but really it should be judicial folks protected as well as Congress.

My substitute amendment, which I will offer for unanimous consent, would make a simple change. My amendment would simply extend the protections that would be offered to the judicial branch to the legislative branch.

So I ask the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn and that the Senator modify his request to include my substitute amendment which is at the desk; that the substitute amendment be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Kentucky to protect Members of the legislative branch. I wish someone would have come to the floor the other night when we had a rush, which I thought was important, to protect Supreme Court Justices. That was a moment in which that could have been pursued. That went through lightning speed. That didn't even have a hearing. It didn't go through the process of the Judiciary Committee like this bill has, but there was no such call.

And so I would work with my colleague on a separate legislation to provide protections for a different universe, including a legislative one. I know there are other Members who want to provide these protections to everyone. The question is that none of that has been moving on the floor. None of that has had the time and attention in the committee processes to ferret out the challenges, the issues, and whatnot. But every day we see violence against judges across the country, and we have an opportunity to take a moment of tragedy and turn it into something powerful.

And I would work with my colleague on his desire, but at this point, because I am concerned that what we would do is not find a pathway in the House because there are already challenges in the House, even to the simple proposition of limiting these protections to Members of the Federal judiciary, I am afraid that such an expansion under this bill would render it useless in terms of any action in the House, and so I have to object to the proposed amendment but with a desire to work with my colleague on anything I can to move forward in a different way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. PAUL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, just a brief remark. You know, I regret that in the goal to protect ourselves, we can't protect others.

Not every law where we seek to provide a protection is ultimately grandly approached. I think that the passage of this bill would send a clear message to our Federal judiciary, who are not on the awesome Supreme Court, that they will be protected just the same as any Supreme Court Justice and that they can make their judgments without fear that violence will come their way to them or their family because of the decisions they make in our society.

And then building upon that success, we can try to build and create greater protections for others. But this maximalist position is, unfortunately, one that, at the end of the day, doesn't provide protection for anyone.

And so I will keep coming back to the floor. We will keep working to try to make this happen because this young man who died senselessly and his parents who had to bury their only son—his memory cannot die in vain.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

MEXICO

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about what I believe are unlawful actions taken by the Government of Mexico against Vulcan Materials Company, which is headquartered in Birmingham, AL.

Vulcan is the Nation's largest producer of construction aggregates, primarily crushed stone, sand, and gravel.

Vulcan is also a major producer of aggregates-based construction materials like asphalt and ready-mixed concrete.

The materials produced by Vulcan are used in nearly all forms of construction, like infrastructure repairs to bridges or roads or when a new office building is being built.

While headquartered in Alabama, Vulcan has 720 facilities and more than 12,000 employees across the United States.

Its reach is also international. Vulcan has operated a quarry in the Yucatan Peninsula of Mexico since the 1980s. The quarry supplies aggregates to Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas. Vulcan has quarried limestone legally in Mexico on land that it owns for over 30 years. It has full ownership of its property in Mexico and owns the limestone reserves on the property. Vulcan also operates the only deepwater port on the Yucatan Peninsula in Mexico. Vulcan operates that port because Vulcan built that port.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that Vulcan has always complied with Mexican law and permitting, which is why I was shocked to hear Mexican